



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,665	03/08/2004	Roger C. Cottrell	P50-0060	3149

7590 08/25/2004

Michelin North America, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
P.O. Box 2026
Greenville, SC 29602-2026

EXAMINER

JULES, FRANTZ F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,665

Applicant(s)

COTTRELL ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz F. Jules

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The abstract is made of multiple sections and includes a formula in between the sections. This is non-conforming to current office practice which requires the abstract to be of a single sentence.

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because:

Figs 1-2 show ring member 10, 14 as part of the rim while the wheel assembly do not include these components on the rim.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

Art Unit: 3617

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 4, the phrase "a tire" is confusing as it is unclear how it relates to previously recited pneumatic, tubeless tire recited above.

In claim 1, lines 6-8, the phrase "the wheel satisfying the relationship: ... is mountable on the wheel by hand without tools" is confusing as it is unclear how can the wheel be mounted on the wheel.

In claim 1, line 6-8, the phrase "the wheel ... is mountable on the wheel by hand without tools" is confusing as it is unclear how this is achieved when figs. 1-2 of the drawings show ring members 10 and 14 which do not appear in the wheel assembly drawing. The examiner assumes that these members assist in mounting of the wheels or else corrections to the drawings and to the specification are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball (US 6,457,501).

Claims 1-4

Ball discloses a wheel for a pneumatic, tubeless tire, comprising a rim having a flange of height H and width Y, and a well having a depth G, a well floor diameter, a well floor circumference Cw, and a well position W relative to the flange on a mounting side of the wheel, a tire having a bead seat circumference, an additional length M.

Ball discloses all of the features as listed above but does not disclose a wheel having a bead seat which satisfy the relationship of $C = 0.5C_w + 2((0.50D_w)^2 + (0.5ow + G + H^2)^2 + (w + y)^2)^{1/2} + M$ which is mountable on the wheel by hand without tools.

The general concept of using design parameters to achieve a bead seat circumference which satisfy the relationship of $C = 0.5C_w + 2((0.50D_w)^2 + (0.5ow + G + H^2)^2 + (w$

Art Unit: 3617

+ $y^2)^{1/2} + M$ and which is mountable on the wheel by hand without tools falls within the range of common knowledge as obvious mechanical expediency and part of common routing design optimization. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ball to include the use of design parameters to achieve a bead seat circumference which satisfy the relationship of $C = 0.5Cw + 2 ((0.5Dw)^2 + (0.5ow + G + H42)^2 + (w + y)^2)^{1/2} + M$ and which is mountable on the wheel by hand without tools in his advantageous wheel in order to reduce stress induced by the tool on the rim and the tire.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Baldi, Cargoule et al, Pompier et al, Kronenberg, Gasakill et al, Shute are cited to show related wheel for pneumatic tire with dimension for optimizing stress.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz F. Jules
Examiner
Art Unit 3617

FFJ

August 23, 2004

**FRANTZ F. JULES
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frantz', with a stylized flourish at the end.